

veloping that international machinery.

Where does this leave us? We are living in a world in which there is no isolation, nor is there adequate use of the machinery of international organization. There is no real morality among nations or respect for international obligations. It is clear that we cannot count on altruism to lead us out of this unsatisfactory situation. But enlightened self-interest, although less appealing to the inexperienced, is a fairly reliable motive.

Enlightened self-interest can make all nations desire peace, because any war injures all nations, more or less. In the past, nations have not gone about preventing war by right means. After the war, attempts were made to repress Germany by violence. The proposal for a peaceful *anschluss* between Germany and Austria was rejected. The long succession of attempts by Stresemann and other German leaders to secure economic equality failed. Hitler's efforts at world disarmament were not responded to. Violence has begotten violence. The peace movement which repeatedly predicted a disastrous result from such a policy can say: "I told you so." Instead of which, we are accused of having failed. But it is more important to find a way out.

The United States cannot escape its share of blame for the present situation, all the more because we set the example of a great nation refusing to agree to anything in advance and claiming the right to complete freedom of action to decide each issue as it arose according to our own particular interests

at the time. Our refusal to join either the League of Nations or the World Court has brought us as well as other nations face to face with an unpleasant and unprofitable world situation, and has weakened the first effort to set up adequate world peace machinery. To redeem the world situation, our policy now should include several points:

1. This country should cease harboring the illusion that it can be isolated.

2. It should turn its attention to rebuilding the machinery of peace. It should join the World Court, as evidence of its belief in the orderly settlement of disputes.

3. It should begin implementing the Pact of Paris. It should define aggression; and define also its action toward an aggressor, whether that action be unilateral or in cooperation with other nations.

4. The United States should define its policy in reference to foreign wars along the following lines:

- (1) No participation in foreign wars—the war referendum as an extension of democracy at home
- (2) Our defense policy limited to defending our shores
- (3) A peace-time prohibition on the export of munitions
- (4) A mandatory war-time embargo on secondary munitions, providing for distinction between aggressor and victim.

5. The general level of international morality must be raised. Therefore, there must be periodic universal meetings of nations.

6. It should establish more adequate control of the United States munitions industry.

7. It should provide better protection for the rights of political and racial minorities at home, and scrupulously maintain our Constitutional Bill of Rights.

8. It should maintain the right of native populations to belong to no one, to be free from exploitation, and to sell their raw materials to all nations on equal terms.

9. It should continue work on the reciprocal trade treaties and should strive to achieve world economic cooperation.

10. It should call a fourth Hague Conference to continue those early efforts at developing universal peace machinery. The permanent results of such a conference would presumably be merged with the League of Nations, but the Hague Conference might offer a fresh approach, making it easier for the United States, Germany, Italy, Japan, and other nations now outside the League of Nations, to take part.

11. Under such a universal gathering of nations, the United States should take its full responsibility in working for disarmament which is a logical consequence of the universal opposition to aggression.

A program of this sort would enable the United States to provide for its own welfare by sharing in the immediately necessary work of reconstructing the world community organized for peace.

Those Already in Our Midst

BY LEONARD S. KENWORTHY

THE report that a group of leading Jews recently approached President Roosevelt with the request that he not appoint Felix Frankfurter to the Supreme Court because of the prominence it would give their race, focuses attention on efforts to curtail the rising tide of anti-Semitism in this country. Those who made the request, if the report is true, were no doubt prompted by the highest motives. They undoubtedly realized Frankfurter's prominence in the legal profession and the high esteem in which he is held by both conservative and liberal lawyers, as revealed in a recent Gallup poll. They were not thinking of him as an individual admirably qualified for the position, but as individual representative of a criticized race. They were willing to sacrifice the prestige that would accompany his appointment in order to divert attention from them-

selves and thereby help abate anti-Semitism in the United States.

That such racial and religious intolerance exists, cannot be denied. Some months ago *Life* magazine carried a picture of a store window on the west coast smeared with signs calling for a boycott because of Jewish ownership. At football games in the Philadelphia area this Fall, anti-Jewish leaflets have been distributed. A typical "flyer" reads in part: "Jews might have lived in America in peace and prosperity. The growing anti-Semitism is their own fault. If Jews do not want a worse pogrom here than Germany ever dreamed of, let them stop persecuting Christians. Above all, let them stop agitating for the overthrow of our form of government. . . Who has the job you ought to have? A Jew. If you have a job, who is going to get it away from you? A Jew. . . Jews are

trying to get us into war, so that they can take over the country. Get rid of the Jews and most of our troubles will be over."

Stickers have also been distributed in this territory. One of them shows a Jewess as the Statue of Liberty with a sickle and hammer in the arm which usually holds the torch of liberty. In the other is a Jewish business man in caricature. On the sticker are the words: "Wake up Americans! Do you want this? Boycott the Jew! Clean up America! Break the red plague!"

Efforts to ease the plight of refugees from totalitarian states have likewise met with widespread resentment among large sections of the American public. Though originally founded as refugees for those who wished to escape from social, economic or religious persecution, most of the colonies immediately denied others

the same freedom that they themselves sought. That tradition of partial tolerance unfortunately lingers with us.

In times like these a part of our responsibility as Christians and as Friends is to speak openly and often about our convictions in regard to tolerance and understanding of this and other minority groups in the United States.

Most of us recognize certain objectionable traits in Jews, yet we are less likely to recognize their more admirable traits. Faith G. Winthrop, "a Gentile American of Puritan stock," summarized some of these better characteristics in *The Forum* for May of this year (reprinted in *Reader's Digest* in June). Of them she wrote: "The first characteristic which specially distinguishes the Jew is this: he, alone among races, worships intelligence. . . My second generalization about Jews as a race is: Jews vary from the norm more widely than do individuals of other races. The Jew is, for good or for bad, extreme." After speaking about the obnoxious Jew, she says: "Jews themselves know the other Jewish types. Most Gentiles do not." In the third place she maintains this: "Among the Jews I have found more genuine loyalty, more understanding, more compassion and more generosity than my Jew-hating friends would ever believe could exist." Discussing the handicaps under which he works, she asserts: "The Jew must often be twice as good as the Gentile to get half as good an opportunity." In conclusion she summarizes her debt to the race by saying: "I have learned a great deal from my Jewish friends—generosity, loyalty, intellectual honesty and inspiration. I have learned gratitude, affection, forbearance. I have learned courage in the face of uncertainty, difficulty and danger. I have learned to appreciate a family spirit which is beautiful and enduring." High testimony this, from one who has been actively associated with them for several years.

In answer to the charge that the Jews run everything in the United States, *Fortune* magazine published a few months ago one of its exhaustive reports, this one on "Jews in America." The editors examined in detail alleged Jewish control of American industry, the organs of public opinion and the professions. The part Jews play was freely admitted, but the facts assembled denied the charge that they anywhere near control these important vocations. George Sokolsky, writing in *The American Magazine* for January, 1935, (reprinted in *Reader's Digest* for September, 1936) under the title, "We Jews," refutes similar charges.

The contribution of this oppressed race through such outstanding leaders as Albert Einstein, Sigmund Freud, Henri Bergson, Louis Brandeis and Ludwig Lewisohn, are only equalled by the additions to world culture by lesser lights—

in the professions and arts, particularly.

The coming months will undoubtedly witness a more widespread and more blatant attack on the Jewish race in this country than we have yet seen. Such a situation calls for a broad understanding on the part of all fair-minded citizens and a verbal defense of their rights as an important minority in the United States.

Friends Central School, Philadelphia.

FINDS ENGLISH OPINION IS PUZZLED

Richard R. Wood sent us this letter from London shortly before the special session of London Yearly Meeting which he went over to attend. He is an editor of the Philadelphia "Friend", and is Executive Secretary of the Peace Committee of the Philadelphia Yearly Meetings.

After Munich, what? English opinion is puzzled. Only a very few people feel at all comfortable. With few exceptions, there is agreement that, under the circumstances, the British and French governments did the right thing in backing down at Munich. Among those who believe that world organization for peace is ultimately necessary, there is regret that the circumstances had been permitted to become what they were at the time of the Munich conversations. Among extreme pacifists there is uneasiness at the imminence of conscription. Everyone is alarmed at the continued increase of armaments. There is an almost universal feeling that the Munich conversations, while they avoided war at the time, did nothing to prevent the recurrence of a similar crisis sooner or later, and probably sooner than later.

Today I attended the debate of the King's speech in the House of Commons. The discussion centered on rearmament, and on the means of speeding it up. People are asking the government what has been done with the money that had already been spent. The rearmament program has been going full blast for two years, and the government's official position is that the country is unprepared. The opposition, instead of criticizing the government's reliance on military force, is mostly criticizing the government's failure to produce the military force on which to rely.

There is a very strong drive for conscription. Today's papers reported a letter signed by twenty members of Parliament, including Lady Astor, all Conservatives, advocating conscription. The other day the Bishop of London and several other prominent men, churchmen and laymen, wrote a letter to the *Times* pointing out that the British people are in the position of the crew of a battleship, and must be always ready to go

into action on a moment's notice. On the other hand, the Prime Minister has stated that he will not propose conscription. This promise would cease to be binding in case of a re-organized Cabinet or of a general election. There is strong opposition to conscription, however, even within the Conservative Party. For instance, a young Conservative M. P. from Stafford, in his maiden speech in the House of Commons this afternoon, said that he would be shocked by any proposal to adopt conscription. On the other hand, as I have already suggested, the extreme pacifists regard proposals for conscription as almost inevitable, and are uncertain in their own minds only of the form the proposals will take.

The extreme pacifists are now attacking the idea of collective security and are engaged in an almost pathetic attempt to advocate a policy of isolation, even in the shadow of Europe's air fleets. Some of the advocates of collective security are apparently permitting their zeal to lead them into expressions which sound like support of a military alliance against Germany and other dictatorships. In the middle is the great group, who believe in the world community and who believe that its necessity has been demonstrated, and not destroyed, by the recent crisis. Many of these moderate people, including many influential members of the Society of Friends, approve collective security defined as provision of means for peaceful settlement of disputes, provision of means for peaceful change, and provision of peaceful means for restraining a nation that resorts to its own armed force instead of to the available means of peaceful settlement and peaceful change.

As to the steps to be taken now to realize this goal of a world community organized by peaceful collective security, there is deep faith in new attempts at disarmament and economic adjustment. The National Peace Council and many other organizations are launching a great petition campaign, calling on the government to seek cooperation of the United States in making a new effort to convene such a conference. The government tries to discourage such efforts, just as does official caution in the United States. But that idea is certainly in the air.

This afternoon, on my way to the House of Commons, I saw a group of nearly a hundred people, quietly standing in the cenotaph in Whitehall to the dead of the World War. They were standing quietly, with bowed heads. They typified the people of England who do not see the way to peace, but who, ardently or wistfully, long for peace.

RICHARD R. WOOD.

November 10, 1938